

Remarks:

Applicants have read and considered the Advisory Action dated November 2nd, 2004 and the Office Action dated July 12, 2004. Claims 1-05, 7-9, 12-18 and 20-25 have been amended. Claims 1-25 are pending.

Claims on file have been amended to clarify the invention in consideration of the Examiner's comments. More precisely, claim 1 has been amended in order to specify that the Document Authentication Code of the template, DAC(t), provides for the authentication of the document template by itself, and that the Document Authentication Code of the user data, DAC(d), provides for the authentication of the user data separately from the document template. Similar amendments were made to independent claims 9 and 14.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner has stated that separate authentication of the template and the user data received therein was not recited in the rejected claims. It is believed that the new claims on file positively recite this feature and that this advantageous characteristic of the present invention is now clearly part of the claimed subject matter. As such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the fact that none of the cited references teaches or suggests the separate authentication of a template and of user data inserted therein.

Additionally, the entire set of claims has been amended in order to more clearly identify the template as a document template. Independent claims 1 and 14 further specify that this document template is adapted to receive the user data therein. It is respectfully submitted that this definition is not shorn or suggested by the template of Bjorn. Bjorn defines an image template wherein the template is the data inserted therein. In Bjorn, the template is not a preexisting document template in which data is inserted. Data is used to create an image template, it is not received therein. It is therefore submitted that Bjorn does not teach a step of "providing a document template, said document template being adapted to receive said user data therein", and that the cited references therefor do not teach or suggest all of the elements of the present invention.

In conclusion, Applicants assert that none of the cited prior art documents, taken alone or combined, suggests the step of a method for the separate authentication of a document template and of user data inserted therein as defined in the present claims. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn and the present case be allowed.

A speedy and favorable action on the merits is hereby solicited. If the Examiner feels that a telephone interview may be helpful in this matter, please contact Applicants' representative at (612) 336-4728.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

Dated: _____

1/12/05

By: _____



Gregory A. Sebald
Reg. No. 33,280
GAS/km